

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

Clarence Maddox,	:	
	:	
Petitioner(s),	:	
	:	Case Number: 1:09cv480
vs.	:	
	:	Chief Judge Susan J. Dlott
Warden, Ohio State Penitentiary,	:	
	:	
Respondent(s).	:	

ORDER

This matter is before the Court pursuant to the Order of General Reference in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio Western Division to United States Magistrate Judge Timothy S. Hogan. Pursuant to such reference, the Magistrate Judge reviewed the pleadings and filed with this Court on August 13, 2010 a Report and Recommendation (Doc. 44). Subsequently, the petitioner filed objections to such Report and Recommendation (Doc. 50) and supplemental objections to the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 55).

The Court has reviewed the comprehensive findings of the Magistrate Judge and considered de novo all of the filings in this matter. Upon consideration of the foregoing, the Court does determine that such Recommendation should be adopted.

Accordingly, petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. 3) is **DENIED** with prejudice.

A certificate of appealability will not issue with respect to the claims alleged in the petition, which this Court has concluded are waived and thus procedurally barred from review, because under the first prong of the applicable two-part standard enunciated in *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000), "jurists of reason" will not find it debatable whether

this Court is correct in its procedural ruling. A certificate of appealability also will not issue with respect to the claims alleged in the petition, which are addressed on the merits, in the absence of a substantial showing that petitioner has stated a “viable claim of the denial of a constitutional right” or that the issues presented are “adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.” *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 475 (citing *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 & n.4 (1983)); see also 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b).

With respect to any application by petitioner to proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis*, the Court will certify pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(a)(3) that an appeal of any Order adopting the Report and Recommendation will not be taken in “good faith,” and therefore, will **DENY** petitioner leave to appeal *in forma pauperis* upon a showing of financial necessity. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 24(a); *Kincade v. Sparkman*, 117 F.3d 949, 952 (6th Cir. 1997).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Susan J. Dlott
Chief Judge Susan J. Dlott
United States District Court